

Ben Bradlee, executive editor
Washington Post
1150 15 St., NW
Washington, D.C. 20071

6/13/91

Dear Ben,

If I believed that you are prejudiced or want the Post to be unfair or prejudiced I'd not take time to write you about today's Style piece on the AIPAC. It is unfair. It is prejudiced and like all the Post's reporting from and about Israel that I can recall it is two-dimensional. The net result is to mislead, misinform and prejudice your readers.

Including in the executive and legislative branches.

Comparing AIPAC with the NRA alone among successful lobbies is inflammatory. It represents the intent to incite prejudice if not worse.

Saying that AIPAC supports the Likud government is dishonest. Like most Jews here and in Israel it supports some of Likud's policies. I dislike Likud very much but I do agree with some its policies and believe they are essential to the survival of Israel and in preventing still another Holocaust.

The situation there is enormously complicated. I've never seen any Post reporting of it that would give its readers any understanding of this. Two peoples can each make legitimate claims to the same land. I do not recall that the Post has ever tried to inform its readers of this, either.

I do recall the Post's extensive reporting of the deplorable conditions of some Arabs in what the Post, and not it alone, refers to as "occupied" territory. Is it more an occupied territory today than from the time of Mohammed it was an occupied territory ~~then~~ until the State of Israel was established? Did the Post report the conditions under which the Arabs in those territories lived when they were occupied by Jordan and ~~then~~ Egypt? When they were immeasurably worse? When they had ~~xx~~ fewer rights?

Aside from the religious and racial elements the situation there is not abnormal in the history of the world, ancient and recent. Thus, without this kind of reporting by the Post, for example, Prussia would not be part of Poland, among a number of illustrations.

For that matter, the United States would end at the Mississippi. Puerto Rico would be independent. Panama would still be part of Columbia.

The one difference is that Israel is a Jewish state.

Were it not for their wholesale slaughter beginning with the Greeks and Romans and greatly increased by Christians and Mohammedans, Jews would today be a much larger percentage of the world's people. They were 10 percent of the Roman empire before these larger slaughters began. Their slaughter by Christians and Mohammedans were religious policy. With Christians it was an ancient policy before the Inquisition.

As recently as World War II the United States along with the rest of the world bears a great responsibility for much of Hitler's Holocaust. Many of those he killed could have

been saved. For one example, the Saint Louis brought an entire shipload here and the FDR government refused to let it land. They were returned to be burned. Many thousands of Jewish children were taken to the south of Vichy France to be saved ^{by} ~~by~~ no country would accept them, and they, too, were burned.

With all the great amount of space the Post has devoted to what I hope you can come to see is two-dimensional reporting, I do not recall that it has ever informed its readers of the immediate cause of the present situation, British imperial policy and such powerful anti-Semitism that even Churchill could not overcome it. There was an international understanding that the Palestine territory would be divided into Jewish and Palestinian Arab states. (Jews then were about half the population of Jerusalem.) Trans-Jordan was created as the Arab state but with what remained no Jewish state was created. Thereafter Arabs refused even to discuss creation of any Jewish state. Not even the minuscule one proposed by the British Peel Commission in 1937. That proposed state would have been about 10 % of the State of Israel when first established. Except for Egypt, whose Sadat did not survive it, no Muslim state has recognized the existence of the State of Israel and, contrary to the Post's reporting, Arafat never did.

For Israel and for most Jews elsewhere the real and immediate question is one of survival. However it may be described by those with special interests or views, those lands that had been occupied by renamed Jordan, renamed to hide the history, are where Jews come from. Without control over them much of Israel is within easy range of the artillery of not only the Arab states still in a state of war with Israel - the multitudinous and uncontrollable PLO factions also have that capability.

How secure do you think people living in Alexandria would feel if they knew that those determined to wipe them out and have a stated policy of doing that were so well armed as close as Bethesda? This is the Israeli ~~reality~~ reality.

I have no reason to believe that you, with all your responsibilities and obligations, have the time to familiarize yourself with either a full or only the modern history of that area but if there is anyone on your staff you would like to do this, a Christian British writer, Paul Johnson, has written an excellent "A History of the Jews." Its last chapter deals with the background of the present situation.

There is a real question of Israel's survival, or still another Holocaust. That, not "defending Mikud," is what concerns AIPAC and not it alone.

Today's story is very unfair. It will mislead and misinform most of your readers.

Regretfully,


Harold Weisberg